

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-38210-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 15.09.2021

Surinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. S.S. Sarwara, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 282 dated 10.07.2021, registered under Section 395 IPC, at Police Station Baldev Nagar, District Ambala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. The petitioner is not associated with any 'farmers company'. The petitioner is a transporter and income tax payee also. There is no MLR of the complainant or his uncle to show that the petitioner and his companions have inflicted injuries upon them.

It is a case, where 10/12 persons have looted a truck loaded with

489 boxes of apples and abducted the complainant and his uncle. As per the CCTV footage, the complainant and his uncle were pushed out of the vehicle. Even, the car used in commission of the crime, belongs to an NRI and the same was borrowed by the petitioner from the father of its owner some days prior to the incident.

Considering the very nature of the allegations contained in the FIR, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must, especially so when CCTV footage, prima-facie, indicates towards the involvement of the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

15.09.2021
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No